

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/086,775 03/01/2002		Paul Joseph Berlowitz	JJD-0101 8963		
27810 7	11/01/2006		EXAMINER		
EXXONMO	BIL RESEARCH AND E	TOOMER, CEPHIA D			
P.O. BOX 900 1545 ROUTE 2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ANNANDALI	E, NJ 08801-0900	1714			

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					1_	
		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/086,77	10/086,775		BERLOWITZ ET AL.	
(Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit		
		Cephia D.		1714		
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	dress	
A SHORT WHICHEN - Extensions after SIX (6 - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I YER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI of time may be available under the provisions of 37 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical if for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ply within the set or extended period for reply will, be decived by the Office later than three months after the ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no evention. period will apply and wing y statute, cause the apply	IIS COMMUNICATIO int, however, may a reply be tin Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this co ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a)∐ This 3)∐ Sind	ponsive to communication(s) filed or action is FINAL . 2b) te this application is in condition for a ed in accordance with the practice u	☐ This action is nallowance except	on-final. for formal matters, pr		e merits is	
Disposition o	f Claims					
4a) 0 5)	m(s) 1.5-10 and 12 is/are pending in Of the above claim(s) is/are w m(s) is/are allowed. m(s) 1.5-10 and 12 is/are rejected. m(s) is/are objected to. m(s) are subject to restriction Papers specification is objected to by the Ex	ithdrawn from con				
10)∭ The App Rep	drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[icant may not request that any objection acement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) to the drawing(s) b correction is require	e held in abeyance. Se ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CF		
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Ackr a) Al 1. 2. 2. 3.	owledgment is made of a claim for for b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents	uments have bee uments have bee e priority docume Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat ents have been receiv e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage	
2) Notice of D 3) Information	deferences Cited (PTO-892) Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 Proposition Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Proposition Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/086,775 Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 8, 2006 has been entered.
- 2. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed August 8, 2006 in which claim 1 was amended. The 103 rejection over WO9913031 in view of WO9907465 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1, 9 and their dependents are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 9 and their dependents are rejected because since to practice the claim requires knowledge of something that is not of Applicant's invention, it is not clear how one skilled in the art would know at what point the improved reduction has

Application/Control Number: 10/086,775

Art Unit: 1714

occurred. Furthermore, it is not clear how the Swedish fuel would react under the conditions set forth in the present claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 5-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO9963025.

WO teaches a hydrocarbon in water emulsion comprising diesel fuel or Fischer-Tropsch derived fuel, water, alcohol and a surfactant. The droplets are less than 10 micron in size (see abstract; page 3, lines 20-22; page 7, lines 22-32; page 23, lines 19-23). WO teaches that the fuel emulsion of his invention relates to reduced nitrogen oxide and particulate emissions (see page 2, lines 26-29). The amount of hydrocarbon is from 43-70% by weight and the amount of water is from 28-55% by weight (see col. 3, lines 23-31). The amount of surfactant is about 0.5% (see Examples). WO teaches the limitations of the claims other than the differences that are discussed below.

In the first aspect, WO differs from the claims in that WO fails to teach how the fuel of its invention compares to Swedish Class I Diesel Fuel. However, given the 112, second paragraph rejection it is not clear how one would determine this comparative

Application/Control Number: 10/086,775

Art Unit: 1714

value given that it is not clear how Swedish Diesel would react under the conditions set forth in the present claims.

In the second aspect, WO differs from the claims in that it fails to teach the claimed particle size. However, WO teaches that the droplets are 10 microns or less and this teaching suggests a particle size of 0.1 to about 1.0 microns. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the particles size through routine experimentation for the best results. As to optimization results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variables when the optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

In the third aspect, WO differs from the claims in that it does not specifically teach the viscosity of the fuel. However, since WO teaches an emulsified fuel containing the same components that are within the same range as Applicant, it would be reasonable to expect that the viscosity of the fuel emulsion would be the same or similar to that of the present invention, absent evidence to the contrary.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Art Unit: 1714

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cephia D. Toomer Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

10086775\20061030